

Docket No.: REICHSTEIN
Appl. No.: 10/603,459

REMARKS

The last Office Action of March 9, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. An amendment to the specification has been made to add a "period" at the end of paragraph [0004]. No fee is due.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,186,760 to Latham.

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by either German Pat. No. DE 19909307 to Krause et al., or European Pat. No. EP 1128244 to Meschia, or the Abstract of German Pat. No. DE 20204359 (hereinafter "DE '359").

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either of Latham, Krause et al., Meschia, or DE '359, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

It is further noted that the declaration is considered defective because it does not identify the instant application by application number and filing date. The objection of the declaration is confusing because the declaration, as filed on September 19, 2003 clearly identifies the application number and filing date on page 1. A copy of the filed declaration is enclosed for review by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection to the declaration is respectfully requested.

Docket No.: REICHSTEIN
Appl. No.: 10/603,459

In order to clearly set forth the features of the present invention and to more clearly distinguish the present invention from the applied prior art, applicant has amended claim 1 by expressly setting forth that the machine control and the electric components are parts that are incorporated in the machine so that the wireless transmission is realized internally. As described in the instant specification in paragraph [0005], a drawback of prior art machines is the provision of cables to connect electric components of the machine because of the risk of contact with hot surfaces that can lead to a melting of cables, or risk of damage. To address these problems, the inventors contemplate the provision of a wireless communication between parts of the machine to replace hardware connections (paragraph [0008]) and thereby minimize the use of cables (paragraph [0006]).

The Latham reference describes a system for monitoring and controlling a blow mold machine by using a wireless communication between the machine and a computer at a remote site (col. 3, lines 41 to 44). In contrast thereto, the present invention is directed to the provision of a wireless transmission between internal parts of the machine.

The Meschia reference discloses a wireless network system for connecting various machines via a server. While Meschia also desires to eliminate a need for wiring, it is concerned, however, with the wiring between separate and distant machines (see, e.g., paragraph [0025] in col. 4). Thus, also Meschia is silent as to a wireless transmission between internal parts of a single machine.

Docket No.: REICHSTEIN
Appl. No.: 10/603,459

The Krause reference also merely discloses a wireless communication between an external PC (laptop 11) and a machine (see col. 3, lines 27 to 32 and the Figure). Krause describes in col. 4, lines 37 to 39 as follows:

The portable industrial PC 12 has an aerial 13 which is in communication with an aerial 14 on the plastics machine. Between both, the wireless connection according to the invention is established."

Thus, also Krause is silent as to a wireless transmission between internal parts of a single machine.

DE '359 discloses an injection molding machine with programmable system for monitoring an control and uses a wireless communication between the machine and an external processing unit. Thus, also DE '359 is silent as to a wireless transmission between internal parts of a single machine.

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that neither Latham, nor Meschia, nor Krause, nor DE '359, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 1.

As for the rejection of the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Docket No.: REICHSTEIN
Appl. No.: 10/603,459

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: July 5, 2005
350 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:af